



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 180  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,159	06/20/2003	Joshua T. Goodman	MSFTP418US	7622

27195 7590 01/25/2007  
AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER  
1900 EAST NINTH STREET  
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER
----------

COULTER, KENNETH R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/25/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/601,159

Applicant(s)

GOODMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Kenneth R. Coulter

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-75 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-75 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. Claims 16 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities:  
  
no period at the end of a sentence.

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Double Patenting*

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 2141

3. Claims 1 – 4, 35 – 38, and 61 – 75 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 15 – 17, 21, 24, 30, 32, 33, and 35 of copending Application No. 10/180,565. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following mapping below.

Claim 1 of the present Application maps to claims 1, 11, 21, 30 and 33 of '565.

Claim 2 of the present Application maps to claims 1, 11, 21, 30 and 33 of '565.

Claim 3 of the present Application maps to claims 5, 15, 24, 32 '565.

Claim 4 of the present Application maps to claims 1, 11, 21, 30 and 33 of '565.

Claim 35 of the present Application maps to claims 1, 11, 21, 30 and 33 of '565.

Claim 36 of the present Application maps to claims 1, 11, 21, 30 and 33 of '565.

Claim 37 of the present Application maps to claims 1, 11, 21, 30 and 33 of '565.

Claim 38 of the present Application maps to claims 1, 11, 21, 30 and 33 of '565.

Claim 61 of the present Application maps to claims 1, 11, 21, 30 and 33 of '565.

Claim 62 of the present Application maps to claims 1, 11, 21, 30 and 33 of '565.

Claim 63 of the present Application maps to claims 5, 15, 24, 32 of '565.

Claim 64 of the present Application maps to claims 7, 16, 24, 32 of '565.

Claim 65 of the present Application maps to claims 1, 11, 17, 21, 24, 30 and 33 of '565.

Art Unit: 2141

Claim 66 of the present Application maps to claims 7, 16, 24, 32, 5, 15 of '565.

Claim 67 of the present Application maps to claims 17, 24 of '565.

Claim 68 of the present Application maps to claims 1, 11, 21, 30 and 33 of '565.

Claim 70 of the present Application maps to claim 35 of '565.

Claim 71 – 75 the above mapping applies fully.

4. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1 - 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0003283 (Spam Detector with Challenges).

Art Unit: 2141

The applied reference has a common assignee Microsoft and two common inventors, Joshua T. Goodman and Robert L. Rounthwaite, with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

6.1 Regarding claim 1, Goodman discloses a system that facilitates mitigation of outgoing spam, comprising:

a detection component that detects a potential spammer in connection with at least one outgoing message, the outgoing message comprising **at least one of** instant message spam, whisper spam, and chat room spam, the detection being based in part on at least one of spam filtering, message volume monitoring, total recipient counting, unique recipient counting, message rate monitoring, number of apparently legitimate messages, and number of non-deliverable messages (Figs. 1 – 5; Abstract; paragraphs 41, 74); and

an action component that upon receiving information from the detection component that an entity is a potential spammer, initiates at least one action that facilitates any one of confirming that the entity is a spammer, mitigating spamming by the entity, increasing spammer cost, and a combination thereof (paragraphs 14, 39, 40, 51).

6.2 Per claim 2, Goodman teaches the system of claim 1, the outgoing message further comprising email message spam (paragraphs 12, 37).

6.3 Regarding claim 3, Goodman discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the action initiated comprises at least one of: shutting down the potential spammer's user account; requiring any one of a HIP challenge and a computational challenge to be solved by the potential spammer and the potential spammer computer, respectively; sending the potential spammer a legal notice regarding at least one violation of messaging service terms; and manual inspection of at least a subset of outgoing messages generated by the potential spammer (paragraphs 14, 38, 49).

6.4 Per claim 4, Goodman teaches the system of claim 1, wherein message volume monitoring comprises at least one of tracking and counting outgoing messages (paragraph 50).

6.5 Regarding claim 5, Goodman discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the recipient count is computed with each recipient counted only once (paragraph 13).

6.6 Per claim 6, Goodman teaches the system of claim 5, comprising keeping track of the maximum score per recipient (paragraph 13).

6.7 Regarding claim 7, Goodman discloses the system of claim 5, comprising using a pseudo-random function of recipients to estimate the recipient count, or related scores (paragraphs 74, 89).

6.8 Per claim 8, Goodman teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the message rate monitoring comprises computing the volume of outgoing messages over a duration of time (paragraph 74).

6.9 Regarding claim 9, Goodman discloses the system of claim 8, wherein the duration of time comprises at least one of minutes, hours, days, weeks, months, and years (paragraphs 15, 18, 42, 53, 57, 66).

6.10 Per claim 10, Goodman teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the message volume monitoring comprises a total volume of messages since activation of a user account (paragraph 74).

6.11 Regarding claim 11, Goodman discloses the system of claim 1, wherein each recipient of an outgoing message constitutes one message (Abstract; Figs. 4, 10).

6.12 Per claim 12, Goodman teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the recipient count comprises one or more recipients listed in at least one of a to:



field, a cc: field, and a bcc: field (paragraphs 75, 77).

6.13 Regarding claim 13, Goodman discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the detection component processes and analyzes the outgoing messages to determine at least one of whether the message is likely to be spam and whether the sender is a potential spammer (Abstract; paragraphs 12, 13).

6.14 Per claim 14, Goodman teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the number of apparently legitimate messages is used as a bonus to offset other scores (paragraphs 12, 15, 16, 18).

6.15 Regarding claim 15, Goodman discloses the system of claim 14, wherein the number of apparently legitimate messages is estimated with a spam filter (paragraphs 12, 15, 16, 18).).

6.16 Per claim 16, Goodman teaches the system of claim 14, wherein the bonus from the number of apparently legitimate messages is limited (paragraphs 12, 15, 16, 18).).

6.17 Regarding claim 17, Goodman discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the number of non-deliverable messages is estimated at least in part from failures at message delivery time (paragraphs 15, 18, 42).

Art Unit: 2141

6.18 Per claim 18, Goodman teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the number of non-deliverable messages is estimated at least in part from Non Delivery Receipts (paragraphs 15, 18, 42).

6.19 Regarding claim 19, Goodman discloses the system of claim 18, wherein validity of the Non Delivery Receipts is checked (paragraphs 15, 18, 42).

6.20 Per claim 20, Goodman teaches the system of claim 19, wherein validity of the Non Delivery Receipts is checked against a list of recipients of messages from the sender (paragraphs 15, 18, 42).

6.21 Regarding claim 21, Goodman discloses the system of claim 20, wherein the list of recipients is a sample and the penalty of a Non Delivery Receipt is correspondingly increased (paragraphs 15, 18, 42).

6.22 Per claim 22, Goodman teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the detection component computes scores assigned to the outgoing messages to determine a total score per sender and compares the total score per sender with at least one threshold level to ascertain whether the sender is a potential spammer (Abstract; paragraph 12 – 14).

6.23 Regarding claim 23, Goodman discloses the system of claim 22, wherein threshold levels are adjustable per sender (paragraph 12).

6.24 Per claim 24, Goodman teaches the system of claim 1, wherein spam filtering comprises employing a filter trained to recognize at least one of non-spam like features and spam-like features in outgoing messages (paragraphs 16, 46, 50).

6.25 Regarding claim 25, Goodman discloses the system of claim 1, wherein spam filtering is performed with a machine learning approach (paragraph 13).

6.26 Per claim 26, Goodman teaches the system of claim 1, wherein spam filtering comprises assigning a probability per outgoing message to indicate a likelihood that the message is any one of more spam-like or less spam-like (paragraphs 16, 46, 50).

6.27 Regarding claim 27, Goodman discloses the system of claim 1, further comprising a scoring component that operates in connection with at least one of the spam filtering, total recipient count, unique recipient count, message volume monitoring, and message rate monitoring (paragraph 74).

6.28 Per claim 28, Goodman teaches the system of claim 27, wherein the scoring component assigns a score per sender based at least in part upon volume of outgoing messages, rate of outgoing messages, recipient count, and message content (paragraph 74).

Art Unit: 2141

6.29 Regarding claim 29, Goodman discloses the system of claim 27, wherein the scoring component assigns and/or adds a constant value to one or more outgoing messages to mitigate spammers from manipulating spam filtering systems (Abstract; paragraph 13).

6.30 Per claim 30, Goodman teaches the system of claim 27, wherein the scoring component assigns a selected value to outgoing messages identified as having at least one spam-like feature (paragraphs 79, 80, 85).

6.31 Regarding claim 31, Goodman discloses the system of claim 30, wherein the at least one spam-like feature is a URL (paragraphs 54, 119).

6.32 Per claim 32, Goodman teaches the system of claim 30, wherein the at least one spam-like feature comprises contact information (paragraphs 19, 59).

6.33 Regarding claim 33, Goodman discloses the system of claim 32, wherein the contact information comprises a telephone number, the telephone number comprising at least one of an area code and a prefix to identify a geographic location associated with the message to thereby facilitate identifying the potential spammer (paragraphs 19, 59).

6.34 Per claim 34, Goodman teaches the system of claim 1 further comprising

Art Unit: 2141

a user-based message generator component that generates outgoing messages addressed to one or more recipients based in part upon sender preferences (paragraphs 55, 64).

6.35 Regarding claims 35 – 75, the rejection of claims 1 – 34 under 35 USC 102(e) (paragraphs 6.1 – 6.34 above) applies fully.

7. Claims 1 – 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wilson (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0015554) (Active E-Mail Filter With Challenge-Response).

7.1 Regarding claim 1, Wilson discloses a system that facilitates mitigation of outgoing spam, comprising:

a detection component that detects a potential spammer in connection with at least one outgoing message, the outgoing message comprising **at least one of** instant message spam, whisper spam, and chat room spam, the detection being based in part on at least one of spam filtering, message volume monitoring, total recipient counting, unique recipient counting, message rate monitoring, number of apparently legitimate messages, and number of non-deliverable messages (Abstract; Figs. 2, 3; paragraphs 23, 37); and

an action component that upon receiving information from the detection component that an entity is a potential spammer, initiates at least one action that

Art Unit: 2141

facilitates any one of confirming that the entity is a spammer, mitigating spamming by the entity, increasing spammer cost, and a combination thereof (Abstract; paragraph 59).

7.2 Per claim 2, Wilson teaches the system of claim 1, the outgoing message further comprising email message spam (Abstract; paragraphs 23, 37).

7.3 Regarding claim 3, Wilson discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the action initiated comprises at least one of: shutting down the potential spammer's user account; requiring any one of a HIP challenge and a **computational challenge** to be solved by the potential spammer and the potential spammer computer, respectively; sending the potential spammer a legal notice regarding at least one violation of messaging service terms; and manual inspection of at least a subset of outgoing messages generated by the potential spammer (paragraphs 45, 55).

7.4 Per claim 4, Wilson teaches the system of claim 1, wherein message volume monitoring comprises at least one of tracking and counting outgoing messages (paragraphs 25, 63).

7.5 Regarding claim 5, Wilson discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the recipient count is computed with each recipient counted only once (paragraphs 25, 63).

7.6 Per claim 6, Wilson teaches the system of claim 5, comprising keeping track of the maximum score per recipient (paragraphs 25, 63).

7.7 Regarding claim 7, Wilson discloses the system of claim 5, comprising using a pseudo-random function of recipients to estimate the recipient count, or related scores (paragraphs 25, 55, 63).

7.8 Per claim 8, Wilson teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the message rate monitoring comprises computing the volume of outgoing messages over a duration of time (paragraphs 25, 63).

7.9 Regarding claim 9, Wilson discloses the system of claim 8, wherein the duration of time comprises at least one of minutes, hours, days, weeks, months, and years (paragraphs 25, 63).

7.10 Per claim 10, Wilson teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the message volume monitoring comprises a total volume of messages since activation of a user account (paragraphs 23, 37, 69).

7.11 Regarding claim 11, Wilson discloses the system of claim 1, wherein each recipient of an outgoing message constitutes one message (paragraphs 23, 37).

Art Unit: 2141

7.12 Per claim 12, Wilson teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the recipient count comprises one or more recipients listed in at least one of a to: field, a cc: field, and a bcc: field (Fig. 4; paragraph 72).

7.13 Regarding claim 13, Wilson discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the detection component processes and analyzes the outgoing messages to determine at least one of whether the message is likely to be spam and whether the sender is a potential spammer (Abstract; Figs. 2, 3; paragraphs 23, 37).

7.14 Per claim 14, Wilson teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the number of apparently legitimate messages is used as a bonus to offset other scores (Abstract; Figs. 2, 3; paragraphs 23, 37).

7.15 Regarding claim 15, Wilson discloses the system of claim 14, wherein the number of apparently legitimate messages is estimated with a spam filter (Abstract; Figs. 2, 3; paragraphs 23, 37).

7.16 Per claim 16, Wilson teaches the system of claim 14, wherein the bonus from the number of apparently legitimate messages is limited (Abstract; Figs. 2, 3; paragraphs 23, 37).

7.17 Regarding claim 17, Wilson discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the number of non-deliverable messages is estimated at least in part from failures at



Art Unit: 2141

message delivery time (paragraphs 47, 56, 63).

7.18 Per claim 18, Wilson teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the number of non-deliverable messages is estimated at least in part from Non Delivery Receipts (paragraphs 47, 56, 63).

7.19 Regarding claim 19, Wilson discloses the system of claim 18, wherein validity of the Non Delivery Receipts is checked (paragraphs 47, 56, 63).

7.20 Per claim 20, Wilson teaches the system of claim 19, wherein validity of the Non Delivery Receipts is checked against a list of recipients of messages from the sender (paragraphs 47, 56, 63).

7.21 Regarding claim 21, Wilson discloses the system of claim 20, wherein the list of recipients is a sample and the penalty of a Non Delivery Receipt is correspondingly increased (paragraphs 47, 56, 63).

7.22 Per claim 22, Wilson teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the detection component computes scores assigned to the outgoing messages to determine a total score per sender and compares the total score per sender with at least one threshold level to ascertain whether the sender is a potential spammer (paragraphs 63, 25).

Art Unit: 2141

7.23 Regarding claim 23, Wilson discloses the system of claim 22, wherein threshold levels are adjustable per sender (paragraph 52).

7.24 Per claim 24, Wilson teaches the system of claim 1, wherein spam filtering comprises employing a filter trained to recognize at least one of non-spam like features and spam-like features in outgoing messages (Abstract; Figs. 2, 3; paragraphs 23, 37).

7.25 Regarding claim 25, Wilson discloses the system of claim 1, wherein spam filtering is performed with a machine learning approach (Abstract; Figs. 2, 3; paragraphs 23, 37).

7.26 Per claim 26, Wilson teaches the system of claim 1, wherein spam filtering comprises assigning a probability per outgoing message to indicate a likelihood that the message is any one of more spam-like or less spam-like (Abstract; Figs. 2, 3; paragraphs 23, 37).

7.27 Regarding claim 27, Wilson discloses the system of claim 1, further comprising a scoring component that operates in connection with at least one of the spam filtering, total recipient count, unique recipient count, message volume monitoring, and message rate monitoring (paragraphs 47, 56, 63).

7.28 Per claim 28, Wilson teaches the system of claim 27, wherein the scoring

Art Unit: 2141

component assigns a score per sender based at least in part upon volume of outgoing messages, rate of outgoing messages, recipient count, and message content (paragraphs 47, 56, 63).

7.29 Regarding claim 29, Wilson discloses the system of claim 27, wherein the scoring component assigns and/or adds a constant value to one or more outgoing messages to mitigate spammers from manipulating spam filtering systems (paragraphs 47, 56, 63).

7.30 Per claim 30, Wilson teaches the system of claim 27, wherein the scoring component assigns a selected value to outgoing messages identified as having at least one spam-like feature (Abstract; Figs. 2, 3; paragraphs 23, 37).

7.31 Regarding claims 31 – 33, Wilson does not explicitly disclose other spam-like features such as a URL or telephone number. However, these features are commonly included in spam in order for the spam recipient to have access to the spammer.

7.32 Per claim 34, Wilson teaches the system of claim 1 further comprising a user-based message generator component that generates outgoing messages addressed to one or more recipients based in part upon sender preferences (Abstract; Figs. 2, 3; paragraphs 23, 37).

Art Unit: 2141

7.33 Regarding claims 35 – 75, the rejection of claims 1 – 34 under 35 USC 102(e) (paragraphs 7.1 – 7.32 above) applies fully.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth R. Coulter whose telephone number is 703 305-8447. The examiner can normally be reached on 5 4 9.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 703 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2141

krc

KENNETH P. COUTER  
/Kenneth P. Couter

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :12/29/06; 11/7/06; 7/31/06; 5/10/06; 3/21/06; 2/27/06; 1/20/06; 10/24/06; 9/30/05; 8/22/05; 3/31/05; 1/21/05; 10/12/04; 2/20/04.